



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

09/994,525

11/26/2001

Yehoshua Hershberg

50325-0621

8525

29989

7590

11/16/2005

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP

2055 GATEWAY PLACE

SUITE 550

SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER

ROCHE, TRENTON J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2193

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/994,525 | | HERSHBERG ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | | Art Unit | |
| | Trenton J. Roche | | 2193 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 21-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 21-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 26 and 27 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02102005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2193

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is responsive to communications filed 29 August 2005.
2. Per Applicants' request, amended claims 1, 21, 22 and 23 have been entered. Claims 17-20 have been canceled. Newly added claims 24-27 have been entered. Claims 1-16 and 21-27 are currently pending.
3. Claims 1-16 and 21-27 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicants' arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 13-16 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,953,526 to Day et al. (hereinafter "Day").

Per claims 1 and 21-23:

Day discloses:

Art Unit: 2193

- receiving, from a source code file, comment data including first data indicating a parameter of the data exchange format, wherein the comment data is ignored by a source code processor of the source language (“When a comment section is found, the various tags are parsed...” in col. 8 lines 32-33. Further, note Figure 2, item 51. The tags parsed by the JavaDoc utility are JavaDoc recognized parameters, and tags themselves have parameters. Finally, comments are ignored by Java processors.)
- receiving from the source code file second data, associated with the comment data, indicating a statement that defines a class of data objects in the source language (“Immediately after the comment...the parser looks for a Java string which it uses as an identifier...This identifier is used to reference the class file to get the message associated with the comment data...” in col. 8 lines 35-39)
- wherein the data exchange format expresses the structure of data that is exported from, and imported to, data objects of the class of data objects; and automatically generating, based on the first data and the second data, third data that describes the data exchange format, wherein the third data comprises instructions defining a mapping between attributes of the class of data objects and elements of the data exchange format (“It parses the source files, reads them and generates HTML documentation files that describe each public class defined in the source files. The generated file is a result of parsing the “doc comments” that are associated with the class, and with its methods, constructors and attributes and other variables” in col. 6 lines 46-51. As the HTML documentation describes each class along with methods, attributes and variables associated with the class, then the documentation is providing a mapping between the class object and its associated elements.)

substantially as claimed.

Art Unit: 2193

Per claims 2 and 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Day discloses a module to convert a data object of the class of data objects into a data item of the data exchange format as described by the third data as claimed (“the JavaDoc program generates the HTML for the conventional program objects including the comments...” in col. 7 38-39)

Per claims 4 and 5:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Day discloses a module to derive a data object of the class of data objects from a data item of the data exchange format as described by the third data as claimed (“a combined HTML output...which will...control a natural language display...the system also generates a machine code, class...which will be used to control the computer...” in col. 7 lines 42-47)

Per claims 7 and 8:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Day discloses the third data being formatted in XML as claimed (“XML may be derived...” in col. 7 lines 19-20)

Per claims 13 and 14:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Day discloses the source language being Java, and a first data includes a tag for an automated Java documentation system as claimed (Note Figure 2, items 50 and 51 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.)

Art Unit: 2193

Per claim 15:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Day discloses a user-defined tag for the Java documentation system as claimed (Note the rejection regarding claims 13 and 14, and further, “parsing the “doc comments”...” in col. 6 line 49. The user defined the doc comments.)

Per claim 16:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Day discloses generating the third data by a user-defined routine invoked by the automated Java documentation system as claimed (Note the rejection regarding claims 13-15, and further, “the JavaDoc program generates the HTML for the conventional program objects...” in col. 7 lines 38-39. JavaDoc utilizes user-defined routines for parsing.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 6, 9-12, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,953,526 to Day et al. (hereinafter "Day"), in view of Applicants' Admission of Prior Art (hereinafter "AAPA")

Per claim 6:

Art Unit: 2193

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Day does not explicitly disclose the third data being formatted according to a database query language. AAPA discloses that at the time the invention was made, it was well known to represent a data exchange in a database query language (“Such data exchange is often accomplished with a published (open) database query language.” in paragraph 0005 of the Specification). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to format data according to a database query language, as the language could be used to exchange data with database servers in an easy manner.

Per claims 9 and 10:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, while Day discloses the use of XML and the building of XML documents, Day does not explicitly disclose an XML schema document or an XML document type definition (DTD) document. AAPA discloses that at the time the invention was made, it was well known that XML schema documents and XML DTD documents were used in connection with XML (“The elements of an XML document are defined in an XML grammar that is defined in a document type definition (DTD) document or XML schema.” in paragraph 0004 of the Specification). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize an XML schema document or an XML DTD document with the XML system disclosed by Day, as this would ensure that the elements in the XML documents are properly defined.

Per claim 11:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Day discloses the parameter being at least one of a root element associated with a document, an element and an attribute of an element (Note the

Art Unit: 2193

rejection regarding claim 1. Further, Day discloses the output of XML data, “XML may be derived...” in col. 7 lines 19-20. A comment tag placed into an XML file must be any one of a root element, XML element, and an attribute of an XML element.) Day does not explicitly disclose an XML document type definition (DTD) document. AAPA discloses that at the time the invention was made, it was well known that XML DTD documents were used in connection with XML (“The elements of an XML document are defined in an XML grammar that is defined in a document type definition (DTD) document...” in paragraph 0004 of the Specification). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize an XML DTD document with the XML system disclosed by Day, as this would ensure that the elements in the XML documents are properly defined.

Per claim 12:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Day discloses the first data including one or more properties of the parameter as claimed. (“When a comment section is found, the various tags are parsed...” in col. 8 lines 32-33. Further, note Figure 2, item 51. The tag parameter has a property associated with it.) Further, while Day discloses the use of XML and the building of XML documents, Day does not explicitly disclose an XML document type definition (DTD) document. AAPA discloses that at the time the invention was made, it was well known that XML schema documents and XML DTD documents were used in connection with XML (“The elements of an XML document are defined in an XML grammar that is defined in a document type definition (DTD) document...” in paragraph 0004 of the Specification). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize an XML DTD document with

Art Unit: 2193

the XML system disclosed by Day, as this would ensure that the elements in the XML documents are properly defined.

Per claim 24:

Day discloses:

- receiving, from a Java source code file, comment data that comprises one or more tags of the data exchange format and one or more parameters that are associated with the one or more tags, wherein the comment data is ignored by a source code processor of the Java language (“When a comment section is found, the various tags are parsed...” in col. 8 lines 32-33. Further, note Figure 2, item 51. The tags parsed by the JavaDoc utility contain parameters. Finally, comments are ignored by Java processors.)
- receiving from the Java source code file, one or more statements that define a class of data objects in the Java language, wherein the class of data objects is associated with the comment data (“Immediately after the comment...the parser looks for a Java string which it uses as an identifier...This identifier is used to reference the class file to get the message associated with the comment data...” in col. 8 lines 35-39)
- wherein the data exchange format expresses, in eXtensible Markup Language (XML) the structure of data that is exported from, and imported to, data objects of the class of data objects; and based on the one or more tags, the one or more parameters, and the one or more statements, a JavaDoc documentation system generating an XML document that describes the data exchange format, wherein the XML document comprises instructions defining a mapping between attributes of the class of data objects and elements of the data exchange format (“It parses the source files, reads them and generates HTML

Art Unit: 2193

documentation files that describe each public class defined in the source files. The generated file is a result of parsing the “doc comments” that are associated with the class, and with its methods, constructors and attributes and other variables” in col. 6 lines 46-51. As the HTML documentation describes each class along with methods, attributes and variables associated with the class, then the documentation is providing a mapping between the class object and its associated elements. Further, XML can be produced rather than HTML, as noted in col. 7 lines 19-20)

substantially as claimed. While Day discloses the use of XML and the building of XML documents, Day does not explicitly disclose an XML document type definition (DTD) document. AAPA discloses that at the time the invention was made, it was well known that XML DTD documents were used in connection with XML (“The elements of an XML document are defined in an XML grammar that is defined in a document type definition (DTD) document...” in paragraph 0004 of the Specification). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize an XML DTD document with the XML system disclosed by Day, as this would ensure that the elements in the XML documents are properly defined.

Per claim 25:

The rejection of claim 24 is incorporated, and further, Day discloses each of the one or more parameters being any one of a root XML element, an XML element of the data exchange format, and an attribute of the XML element of the data exchange format as claimed (Note the rejection regarding claim 24. A comment tag placed into an XML file must be any one of a root element, XML element, and an attribute of an XML element.)

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 26 and 27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trenton J. Roche whose telephone number is (571) 272-3733. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/994,525
Art Unit: 2193

Page 11

Trenton J Roche
Examiner
Art Unit 2193

TJR



TODD INGBERG
PRIMARY EXAMINER